

M I L L E R & V A N E A T O N
P. L. L. C.

MATTHEW C. AMES
KENNETH A. BRUNETTI†
FREDERICK E. ELLROD III
MARCI L. FRISCHKORN*
MITSUKO R. HERRERA†
WILLIAM L. LOWERY

*Admitted to Practice in
Virginia Only
†Admitted to Practice in
California Only

Incorporating the Practice of
Miller & Holbrooke

1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-4320
TELEPHONE (202) 785-0600
FAX (202) 785-1234

MILLER & VAN EATON, L.L.P.
400 MONTGOMERY STREET
SUITE 501
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-1215
TELEPHONE (415) 477-3650
FAX (415) 477-3652
WWW.MILLERVANEATON.COM

WILLIAM R. MALONE
NICHOLAS P. MILLER
HOLLY L. SAURER‡
JOSEPH VAN EATON

‡Admitted to Practice in
Maryland Only

OF COUNSEL:
JAMES R. HOBSON
GERARD L. LEDERER**
JOHN F. NOBLE
**Admitted to Practice in
New Jersey Only

July 26, 2001

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket 94-102

Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Rules, this is to advise you that representatives of the National Emergency Number Association ("NENA") and the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International, Inc. ("APCO") met today with those members of the staff of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau shown as copied below.

In the meeting for NENA were John Melcher and James Goerke and the undersigned. Representing APCO were Thera Bradshaw and William Hinkle.

Among the topics discussed was the AT&T Phase II waiver request of April 4, 2001. The attached document was distributed. The number and nature of pending and expected wireless E9-1-1 rule waivers also was a subject of general discussion. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to the status of implementation of the wireless E9-1-1 requirements and to means of accelerating the process.

Please direct any questions to the under signed.

Sincerely,

James R. Hobson

cc: Tom Sugrue, Jim Schlichting, Kris Monteith, Blaise Scinto, Tom Navin, Joel Taubenblatt

**REASONS NOT TO GRANT
THE AT&T WAIVER REQUEST**

- MNLS accuracy of 300 to 600 meters (at best) is not good enough.
 - US Wireless, Grayson and SigmaOne all have done better.
 - MNLS has not been tested independently in any comparable way.
 - Pertinent data remains undisclosed.
- Still, there is no clear path to full compliance.
 - TDMA's indefinite duration makes MNLS non-compliant without end.
 - Conversion to GSM (and the companion E-OTD) remains at AT&T's discretion.
- If AT&T can get by on this showing, no pending or future application can be denied.
 - Frustrations over slow implementation do not mean "something is better than nothing."
 - Once in place, inferior solutions will be difficult to remove or improve.
 - To respond to emergencies on poor information may be worse than not responding at all.

- Manufacturers and other vendors need to be committed to the Phase II (and Phase I) process.
 - If they cannot perform as carriers, public safety and the FCC expect, let them say so now.
 - Determine what they can do, feasibly but aggressively.
 - Require their written “can do” pledges in support of any waiver grants.
- Denying AT&T’s request will produce a better solution.
 - The FCC’s discretion to deny is more ample than its discretion to compel specific alternative behavior.
 - Give the carrier a little time (not a lot) to figure out what to do next.
 - Verizon has proposed one possible path toward compliance.¹

¹ We offer this without commenting on the merits of the Verizon waiver request.